REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12, 14, 16, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ahmed et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,735,202, hereinafter "'202") and claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over '202 in view of Johansson et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,820,233, hereinafter "'233"). Respectfully disagreeing with these rejections, the applicant requests reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 recites (emphasis added) "receiving, by the communication infrastructure, **a session response message** that indicates a destination IP address and a destination communication port for the packet communication session." Independent claim 20 recites (emphasis added) "**a packet controller capable of receiving a session response message** that indicates a destination IP address and a destination communication port for the packet communication session." The Examiner cites '202 col. 20, lines 54-62 as teaching this claim language. The paragraph containing this citation reads as follows:

> With respect to a packet that is transferred in the Subnetwork layer, the IP header of the packet contains a source IP address field, a destination IP address field, and a protocol address field. When a mobile host sends a Subnetwork Layer IP packet, it includes its LIPA in the source IP address field. The mobile host includes the LIPA of the corresponding host in the destination IP address field, as currently known to the mobile source. A destination address with a value equal to 0 means the LIPA of the corresponding host is unknown.

The applicant submits that '202, as cited by the Examiner, does not teach or suggest receiving a session response message. The passage refers to a packet being transferred but does not refer to that packet transfer as part of a session.

Independent claim 1 recites (emphasis added) "determining, by the communication infrastructure, a source IP address and a source communication port **for the packet communication session.**" Independent claim 20 recites (emphasis added) "a packet controller capable of...determining a source IP address and a source communication port **for the packet communication session.**" The Examiner cites '202 col. 20, lines 54-60 as teaching this claim language. The paragraph containing this

citation is quoted above. Again, the applicant submits that '202, as cited by the Examiner, does not teach or suggest that the packet transfer described is part of a packet communication session.

Independent claim 1 recites (emphasis added) "receiving, by the communication infrastructure from a communication unit, a link-layer packet for the packet communication session; and generating, by the communication infrastructure, an IP message header and a UDP message header for the link-layer packet **using the source IP address, the source communication port, the destination IP address, the destination communication port, the link-layer packet, and a set of predetermined values to produce an internet protocol (IP) packet comprising the link-layer packet.**" Independent claim 20 recites (emphasis added) "a packet controller capable of...receiving from a communication unit a link-layer packet for the packet communication session, and generating an IP message header and a UDP message header for the link-layer packet **using the source IP address, the source communication port, the destination IP address, the destination communication port, the link-layer packet, and a set of predetermined values to produce an internet protocol (IP) packet comprising the link-layer packet.**" The Examiner cites '202 col. 27, lines 32-36 as teaching this message-header-generation claim language. The paragraph containing this citation reads as follows:

> Referring to FIG. 11A , an illustrative message format for all six types of MMCMs is shown. The message format preferably includes; (i) an IP header field; (ii) a UDP header field; and (iii) a message field. The individual MMCMs will now be described below.

However, the applicant submits that '202, as cited by the Examiner, does not teach or suggest generating an IP message header and a UDP message header for the link-layer packet as claimed. In particular, claims 1 and 20 clearly recite that these headers are generated using **the same** source IP address, **the same** source communication port, **the same** destination IP address, **the same** destination communication port, and **the same** link-layer packet that are received / determined as part of **the same** packet communication **session**. The applicant submits that '202, as cited by the Examiner, does not teach or suggest message header generation in the context of a single packet

communication session. For example, the receiving and determining language of claims 1 and 20 are rejected based on text from columns 6 and 20 of '202, while the generating language of claims 1 and 20 is rejected based on text from column 27 of '202.

Claim 4 recites (emphasis added) "wherein the wireless communication infrastructure comprises a **dispatch agent gateway (DAG)** and wherein the DAG produces the voice-over-IP packet." The Examiner cites '202 as teaching this claim language; however, the applicant does not see a reference to a DAG in '202. Thus, the applicant submits that '202 does not teach or suggest claim 4.

Claim 11 recites (emphasis added) "wherein the session response message comprises a **SIP invite final response message.**" The Examiner cites '202 as teaching this claim language; however, the applicant does not see a reference to a SIP invite final response message in '202. Thus, the applicant submits that '202 does not teach or suggest claim 11.

Since none of the references cited, either independently or in combination, teach all of the limitations of independent claims 1 or 20, or therefore, all the limitations of their respective dependent claims, it is asserted that neither anticipation nor a prima facie case for obviousness has been shown. No remaining grounds for rejection or objection being given, the claims in their present form are asserted to be patentable over the prior art of record and in condition for allowance. Therefore, allowance and issuance of this case is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, if such communication would advance the prosecution of the present application. Lastly, please charge any additional fees (including extension of time fees) or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. **502117 -- Motorola, Inc.**

Respectfully submitted,
R. Battin

By: _____

Jeffrey K. Jacobs
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 44,798
Phone No.: 847/576-5562
Fax No.: 847/576-3750